

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,731	04/09/2004	Yu-Jen Chuang	250122-1470	1519
24504	7590 03/31/2006		EXAM	INER ·
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW			CARTER, WILLIAM JOSEPH	
				
STE 1750			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA,	GA 30339-5948		2875	

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/821,731	CHUANG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	William J. Carter	2875				
The MAILING DATE of this communi		h the correspondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states are reply received by the Office later than three months a earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repulping and the company of the company of the company and will expire SIX (6) MONTH will, by statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed "HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	·					
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>21 February 2006</u> .					
,	·					
,	,—					
closed in accordance with the practic	ce under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		-				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-11 and 13</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ai	re withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,8-11 and 13</u> is/are reject	eted.	•				
7) Claim(s) 3-6 is/are objected to.	ti anno de allo alimano de alimano de					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restric	ition and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers		·				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 October 2005</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
	ction to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received.					
-	documents have been received in Ap	•				
•	of the priority documents have been i	received in this National Stage				
• •	onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office actio	n for a list of the certified copies, not r	received.				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 8-11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mai (6,871,979) in view of Evanicky et al. (6,144,360).

With respect to claim 1, Mai shows, a direct backlight module comprising: a first plate (50); a second plate (46) connected to the first plate forming a space between (Fig. 2); a plurality of light sources (44) disposed in the space; and a third plate (52) with a plurality of openings (58) disposed outside the space directly contacting the first plate where they meet and are fused (Fig. 2). Mai does not explicitly teach the third plate directly and conformally contracting the first plate along a substantial portion of the third plate and the first plate. Evanicky, also drawn to backlighting, teaches a third plate (45) directly and conformally contracting the first plate (42) along a substantial portion of the third plate and the first plate (Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the first and third plate alignment of Evanicky in the backlight of Mai, in order to reflect more light back into the second plate (56) (column 9, line 36-37).

As for claim 2, Mai further shows the direct backlight module wherein the first plate comprises: a plurality of protrusions; and a plurality of recesses, wherein the

Application/Control Number: 10/821,731

Art Unit: 2875

plurality of protrusions and recesses are alternately arranged, and the plurality of light sources are disposed in the plurality of recesses (Fig. 2).

As for claim 8, Mai further shows the backlight module wherein the cross-section of the plurality of protrusions and recesses is trapezoidal-shaped (Fig. 6).

AS for claim 9, Mai further shows the backlight module wherein the cross-section of the plurality of protrusions and recesses is triangular-shaped (Fig. 2).

As for claim 10, Mai further shows the backlight module wherein the first plate is a reflector plate (50).

As for claim 11, Mai further shows the backlight module wherein the second plate is a diffusion plate (46).

As for claim 13, Mai further shows the backlight module wherein the plurality of light sources (44) are lamps.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach or suggest the backlight module wherein a plurality of opening disposed outside the space in a third plate aligned with a plurality of protrusions in a first plate and form a plurality of channels, and the third plate comprises a plurality of flexible portions respectively connected to the sides of the channels.

Art Unit: 2875

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William J. Carter whose telephone number is (571)272-0959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Renee S. Luebke can be reached on (571)272-2009. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

wjc 03/23/06

> RENEE LUEBKE PRIMARY EXAMINER